

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08369 01 OF 02 011741Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W

-----038690 011810Z /41

P 011726Z JUN 78

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0324

S E C R E T SECTION 01 OF 02 GENEVA 08369

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 219, MAY 31, 1978

(SALT TWO-1771)

REF: A. SALT TWO 1750 B. SALT TWO 1721 C. SALT TWO
1766

SUMMARY: US ASKED FOR FURTHER EXPLANATION OF SOVIET PROPOSALS ON NEW TYPES OF ICBMS. SMOLIN RAISED QUESTIONS AS TO CUT-OFF DATE SELECTED BY US, AS WELL AS GIVING STANDARD SOVIET LINE ON NON-APPLICABILITY AND NON-VERIFIABILITY OF INITIAL WEIGHT AND TOTAL IMPULSE CRITERIA IN US NEW TYPES DEFINITION. US ALSO GAVE FURTHER EXPLANATION OF RELATIONSHIP, IN US VIEW, BETWEEN "CONSULTATIONS" AND "COOPERATIVE MEASURES" UNDER ARTICLE II.3 SUBPARA (C), IN ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH EXTENT OF OVERLAP WITH SOVIET PROPOSAL FOR "CONSULTATIONS" RE FUTURE CMC'S. SMOLIN SAID SOVIETS FELT CONSULTATIONS SHOULD BE REQUIRED FOR INCLUSION OF FUTURE CMC'S IN ROUTINE SITUATIONS WHERE NO DISPUTES INVOLVED. SMOLIN REPEATED QUESTIONS RE US STATEMENT ON ALCM/ SRAM RACK INCOMPATIBILITY. SMOLIN ALSO QUESTIONED US ON

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 08369 01 OF 02 011741Z

REFORMULATION FOR ARTICLE VI.5. END SUMMARY.

NEW TYPES OF ICBM'S

1. PEREZ REVIEWED US POSITION ON EXEMPTIONS' HE THEN ASKED FOR RATIONALE REGARDING FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF SOVIET PROPOSAL:

--SELECTION OF JAN. 1, 1977 AS CUT-OFF DATE;
-OMISSION OF INITIAL WEIGHT AND TOTAL IMPULSE OF STAGES
FROM DEFINITIONAL CRITERIA;
-OMISSION OF ANY REFERENCE TO PBV'S
-OMISSION OF CEILING ON TOTAL NUMBER OF RV'S ALLOWED ON
EXISTING ICBM'S;
-OMISSION OF PROVISION ALLOWING OFF-LOADING OF RV'S OR
PENAIDS EVEN IF THIS BROUGHT ABOUT DECREASE GREATER THAN
5 PERCENT IN LAUNCH- OR THROW-WEIGHT.

2. SMOLIN, CAVEATING RESPONSES AS "PRELIMINARY," SAID
DEFINITION OF NEW TYPE OF ICBM SHOULD (A) MEET OBJECTIVE
OF EFFECTIVELY LIMITING STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS AND,
SPECIFICALLY, NEW TYPES OF ICBM'S, (B) INCLUDE NO ELEMENTS
GOING BEYOND THIS OBJECTIVE, AND (C) TAKE INTO ACCOUNT
PROCESS OF MODERNIZATION, WHICH "CANNOT BUT TAKE PLACE."
THESE CONSIDERATIONS HAD PRODUCED TWO CENTRAL ELEMENTS OF
SOVIET POSITION: A DEFINITE CUT-OFF DATE; AND SET OF
"DEFINITE" CRITERIA CORRESPONDING TO FOREGOING REQUIREMENTS.

3. SMOLIN SAID JAN. 1, 1977 CUT-OFF DATE WAS EARLIER THAN
US-PROPOSED DATE, AND THEREFORE ESTABLISHED MORE EFFECTIVE
LIMITATION. HE QUESTIONED US REASONS FOR SELECTING APRIL
15, 1978 DATE. PEREZ SAID US DATE HAD SAME EFFECT AS
SOVIET IN ESTABLISHING PRECISE CUT-OFF FOR OBLIGATION, BUT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 08369 01 OF 02 011741Z

WOULD ALLOW SIDES TO CONTINUE PROGRAMS WHICH HAD REACHED
FLIGHT-TEST STAGE AS OF TIME OF PROPOSAL. SMOLIN ASKED
WHICH PROGRAMS WOULD BE AFFECTED BY SOVIET DATE BUT NOT
BY US DATE. PEREZ DECLINED TO ANSWER, AND ASKED SOVIETS
SAME QUESTION. THEY SUGGESTED BOTH SIDES THINK QUESTION
OVER.

4. SMOLIN CALLED SOVIET NEW TYPES DEFINITION MAJOR STEP
TOWARD US POSITION. HE JUSTIFIED OMISSION OF INITIAL
WEIGHT AND TOTAL IMPULSE FROM DEFINITIONAL CRITERIA ON
GROUNDS THEY WENT BEYOND TASK OF LIMITING NEW TYPES, WOULD
BE SOURCE OF MISUNDERSTANDING AND AMBIGUITY IN VERIFICATION
AND WOULD BE UNWARRANTED INTRUSION INTO TECHNICAL
FIELD OF DESIGN. PEREZ REBUTTED ALL 3 POINTS, AND CHAL-
LENGED SOVIET NON-INCLUSION OF PBV'S IN DEFINITION.

5. SMOLIN SAID SOVIETS COULD NOT UNDERSTAND HOW OFF-LOADING
OF RV'S AND PENAIDS COULD PRODUCE LAUNCH-WEIGHT REDUCTION
GREATER THAN 5 PERCENT, SINCE THROW-WEIGHT WAS SUCH A
SMALL FRACTION OF LAUNCH-WEIGHT. SCHNEITER AGREED SUCH
LARGE DECREASE IN LAUNCH-WEIGHT UNLIKELY, BUT SAID POSSIBIL-
ITY EXISTED--GIVEN FACT THAT TECHNOLOGICAL IMPROVEMENTS

WERE PERMITTED UNDER NEW TYPES DEFINITION--AND SO IT WAS APPROPRIATE TO ALLOW FOR IT. SOVIETS APPEARED TO UNDERSTAND RESPONSE.

6. PEREZ PRESSED SMOLIN ON FRACTIONATION LIMIT. SMOLIN SAID ONLY THAT SOVIET DEFINITION OF NEW TYPE OF ICBM CONTAINED ALL CRITERIA NECESSARY FOR PERIOD OBLIGATION WOULD BE IN FORCE.

HEAVY BOMBER DEFINITION: CONSULTATIONS VS. COOPERATIVE MEASURES

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 08369 02 OF 02 011746Z
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00
INRE-00 ACDE-00 /026 W
-----038777 011815Z /42

P 011726Z JUN 78
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0325

S E C R E T SECTION 02 OF 02 GENEVA 08369

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

7. PEREZ REPEATED WARNKE STATEMENT OF MAY 17 (REF A) ON US UNDERSTANDING OF SOVIET PROPOSAL FOR "CONSULTATIONS" ON FUTURE CRUISE MISSILE CARRIERS, I.E. THAT CONSULTATIONS WOULD INVOLVE CONSIDERATION OF QUESTIONS REGARDING INCLUSION OF CMC'S IN 1320 LIMIT. HE SAID IT WAS US POSITION THAT CONSULTATIONS REQUIRED ONLY IF ONE SIDE HAD QUESTIONS ABOUT OTHER SIDE'S AIRPLANES, ADEQUACY OF FRODS, ETC. OPPORTUNITY FOR SUCH CONSULTATIONS PROVIDED FOR IN ARTICLE XVII. UNDER US PROPOSAL, A SIDE HAD 3 CHOICES IF DISPUTES UNRESOLVED THROUGH CONSULTATIONS:

--ALTER OBSERVABLE FEATURES TO SATISFY OTHER SIDE THAT THEY ARE FRODS;
--OFFER TO UNDERTAKE COOPERATIVE MEASURES TO CONFIRM FRODS NOT MERELY OD'S, OR TO CONFIRM CAPABILITY OR LACK OF CAPABILITY OF AIRPLANE IN QUESTION;
--COUNT ALL AIRPLANES OF TYPE IN QUESTION IN 1320 LIMIT.

HE ASKED WHETHER THIS WAS CONSISTENT WITH SOVIET APPROACH.

8. SMOLIN SAID FROD-BASED TYPE RULE AND OBLIGATORY CONSULTATIONS WERE COMPLEMENTARY. CONSULTATIONS WOULD PRECLUDE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 08369 02 OF 02 011746Z

MISUNDERSTANDINGS, AND SHOULD BE HELD FOR FUTURE CMC'S EVEN IN ROUTINE SITUATIONS WHERE SIDE SATISFIED WITH OTHER'S FULFILLMENT OF OBLIGATIONS ON FRODS.

9. US PRESSED SMOLIN ON WHETHER CONSULTATIONS IN SOVIET VIEW WOULD DEAL ONLY WITH ADEQUACY OF FRODS, OR ALSO WITH QUESTION WHETHER AIRPLANES SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS CMC'S PER SUBPARA (C) OF ARTICLE II.3. SMOLIN SAID DISCUSSION WOULD BEGIN WITH BASIC QUESTION "TO INCLUDE OR NOT TO INCLUDE." FROD ISSUE WOULD NOT EVEN ARISE IN SOME CASES, E.G. IF ALL BOMBERS OF A TYPE WERE EQUIPPED FOR CRUISE MISSILES.

10. SMOLIN ASKED HOW U.S. ENVISAGED TIMING OF CONSULTATIONS WHICH WOULD TAKE PLACE REGARDING INCLUSION OF FUTURE HEAVY BOMBERS PER SUBPARA (B) OF ARTICLE II.3, WHERE SIDES AGREED CONSULTATIONS WOULD BE OBLIGATORY. PEREZ TOOK QUESTION FOR LATER RESPONSE.

11. SMOLIN ASKED WHETHER US STATEMENT OF MAY 5 (REF B) ON INCOMPATIBILITY OF ALCM'S AND SRAM RACKS ON B-52'S MEANT THAT ROTARY LAUNCHERS WILL BE CHANGED, OR CRUISE MISSILES WILL BE CHANGED. PEREZ REPEATED MAY 5 STATEMENT THAT LONG-RANGE CRUISE MISSILES CURRENTLY PLANNED FOR DEPLOYMENT ON B-52'S WOULD NOT FIT EXISTING SRAM LAUNCHERS. SMOLIN ASKED WHETHER OTHER LONG-RANGE CRUISE MISSILES (NOT "CURRENTLY PLANNED FOR DEPLOYMENT ON B-52'S") MIGHT FIT SRAM RACKS. PEREZ TOOK QUESTION.

US REFORMULATION FOR ARTICLE VI.5/RELATIONSHIP TO ARTICLE II.3

12. SMOLIN QUESTIONED RELATIONSHIP OF REVISED US PROPOSAL

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 08369 02 OF 02 011746Z

FOR ARTICLE VI.5 (REF C) TO ARTICLE II.3, SINCE ONLY "CONVERSION" OF AIRPLANES TO CMC'S WAS MENTIONED. PEREZ SAID THAT CRITERIA FOR COUNTING NEWLY CONSTRUCTED CMCS WERE SET FORTH IN ARTICLE VI.2 SUBPARA (C), AND THAT

ARTICLE VI.5 SET FORTH CRITERIA ONLY FOR CONVERTED AIR-PLANES, BOTH PRESENT AND FUTURE. PEREZ CONFIRMED THAT IN BOTH CASES, REFERENCE WAS TO TIME THAT CMCS WOULD BE GIVEN FRODS, EXCEPT FOR B-52S, WHICH WOULD BE GIVEN OBSERVABLE DIFFERENCES.

13. DISCUSSION SHIFTED TO DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SIDES' POSITIONS ON ARTICLE II.3. SMOLIN SAID SOVIETS WOULD EXEMPT ALL EXISTING HEAVY BOMBERS FROM FROD RULE. PEREZ SAID US WOULD EXEMPT ONLY B-52'S, IN EXCHANGE FOR EXEMPTION OF BEAR ASW'S FROM FROD RULE. UNDER US PROPOSAL, IF A B-1 WERE EQUIPPED FOR CRUISE MISSILES, ALL B-1'S WOULD COUNT IN 1320 IN ABSENCE OF FRODS.

14. NEXT MEETING JUNE 6. PEREZ

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: Z
Capture Date: 01 jan 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AGREEMENT DRAFT, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 jun 1978
Decaption Date: 20 Mar 2014
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978GENEVA08369
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D780229-1068
Format: TEL
From: GENEVA USSALTTWO
Handling Restrictions:
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t197806108/aaaadpcm.tel
Line Count: 239
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: b6a4c97d-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: 78 SALT TALKS 1750
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 01 aug 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 2165764
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 219, MAY 31, 1978 (SALT TWO-1771)
TAGS: PARM, US, UR
To: STATE
Type: TE
vdkgvgwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/b6a4c97d-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014